

# 當代釋經學的危機 第七講

我們在第六講已經講過Greg Beale認為福音派的學者對古近東的文獻和聖經的關係，實際上是有四種觀點的。Beale說，可能Peter Enns採用第五種比較激進的觀點，但有承認神的啟示或默示等等。

上次我們講到Peter Enns用「神話」這個字的定義是甚麼？Greg Beale認為，應該就是神話，就不是真的。最後我們講到，Peter Enns問一個問題，究竟神話是不是一個正確的概念來理解創世記呢？Peter Enns怎麼回答這個問題呢？祂用第二個問題來回答第一個問題。第二個問題是說，我們是不是應該用現代的歷史和科學的標準來衡量舊約呢？因為聖經的作者並沒有意識到他們要用這些的標準，他們也不認識這些標準。

## II. 「從Enns的道成肉身模式來看聖經的默示」(續) (Enns's Incarnational Model for Understanding Biblical Inspiration)

### 1. 「Enns的道成肉身的模式，特別在處理歷史和神話的方面」(續) (Enns's incarnational model in relation to “history” and “myth.”)

好，現在Beale繼續引用Peter Enns的話(在原著的41頁)，來總結Enns的觀點：究竟我們應不應該用現代的標準呢？

「Peter Enns暗示：上帝大概不可能容許祂的話來到以色列人中間，是按照現代的真理與錯誤的標準——一個如此宇宙性的、放諸四海皆準的、又是我們能夠預料得到前現代文化能夠明白的標準，而比較可能是用一種他們能夠理解的標準，來讓上帝的話臨到他們，來向以色列人啟示(41頁)，那就包括了當時神話的標準(不要忘記，Peter Enns對神話的定義就包括了編造的故事，41頁)。他總結說，假如有人要回答這個問題或解決這個難題，究竟上帝怎麼遷就祂的啟示給祂古代的人民呢？祂『後面的立場是更適合來解決這個問題的』(41頁)。」

(He answers by saying that it is unlikely that God would have allowed his word to come to the Israelites according to “modern standards of truth and error so universal that we should expect premodern cultures to have understood them.” Rather, more probably, God’s word came to them “according to standards *they* understood” (p. 41), which included mythological standards of the time (and, recall once more, that part of Enns’s definition of “myth” is that “stories *were made up*” [my italics]; p. 41). He concludes that the latter position is “better suited for solving the problem” of how God accommodated his revelation to his ancient people (p. 41).)

就是上帝是用神話的標準來啟示，這是比較能夠解決上帝遷就人的問題。

「Enns承認，大概從主前1000-600年的君王時期開始，有一種清楚的歷史意識，以至於歷史就按照一種比較符合我們當代的標準來記錄下來（43頁）。」

(Enns acknowledges that beginning with the monarchic age (1000–600 BC) more historical consciousness arises, so that history “is recorded with a degree of accuracy more in keeping with contemporary standards” (p. 43).)

就是好像現代精準的記錄。

「但是，假如我們反問Enns：『我們可不可以說，創世記和舊約前面的書卷也是如此有歷史的意識呢？』（43頁）Enns馬上說，不。他說，這是一種值得質疑的邏輯，因為，從君王時期的記載是有它的歷史性證據，但史前和祖長故事是沒有它的歷史性證據（43頁）。同樣一件事，在44頁，Enns就更清楚的說明了：」

(He immediately adds, however, that a negative answer must be given to the question “can we not also conclude that the same can be said for Genesis and other early portions of the Bible?” (p. 43). He continues, “[I]t is questionable logic to reason backward from the historical character of the monarchic account, *for which there is some evidence*, to the primeval and ancestral stories, *for which such evidence is lacking*” (p. 43). He says the same thing even more explicitly on page 44:)

Enns說：「我們會預料到在君王時期，以色列人寫歷史就會更加的準確、逐一記載，因為當時他們已經有了『歷史的自我意識』。就是因為在君王以前的時代沒有這種歷史的意識證據，以致我們有一個問題產生，就是那個時代有無本質上的歷史性。」

(One would expect a more accurate, blow-by-blow account of Israel’s history during this monarchic period, when it began to develop a more “historical selfconsciousness,” as it were. It is precisely the evidence missing from the previous periods of Israel’s history that raises the problem *of the essential historicity* of that period [my italics].)

所以Beale說：「我們現代來到君王時期，應該更有根基了。因為到了君王時期就好像我們今天所講的好的歷史的著作，就是當代或多或少的見證人的報導，是用現代的標準。」

(So, in one respect, we are on somewhat firmer ground when we come to the monarchic period because it is there that we see something more closely resembling what one would expect of “good” history writing by modern standards: a more or less contemporary, eyewitness account.)

「同樣的，Enns又有話說了。」

(Likewise, Enns says a little later, )

Beale就再次引用Enns比較長的話。

「亞伯拉罕來自美索不達米亞的世界，他們都是用神話的方式講宇宙的

起源故事…為甚麼創世記的開始幾章這麼的像古代美索不達米亞的文學呢？就是因為古近東的世界觀是無所不在，而且是當時的標準。是的，不同的文化，有不同的神話，但重點是他們都有神話。」801

(*The Mesopotamian world from which Abraham came was one whose own stories of origins had been expressed in mythic categories . . . The reason the opening chapters of Genesis look so much like the literature of ancient Mesopotamia is that the worldview categories of the ancient Near East were ubiquitous and normative at the time. Of course, different [ancient] cultures had different myths, but the point is that they all had them.*)

「聖經的記載不一樣於所謂的古近東歷史的理由，並不在乎它的歷史是現代的世界觀，因此從任何相似的古近東神話裡抽離出來的。」(聖經的不一樣，不是因為它被抽離出來，結果它是真的，其他的是假的。)

「究竟創世記和古近東的神話有甚麼不同呢？…不同於他們(亞伯拉罕和他的後裔)所敬拜的上帝…和他們周圍國家的神明是不一樣的。」

(*The reason the biblical account is different from its ancient Near Eastern counterparts is not that it is history in the modern sense of the word and therefore divorced from any similarity to ancient Near Eastern myth. What makes Genesis different from its ancient Near Eastern counterparts is that . . . the God they [Abraham and his seed] are bound to . . . is different from the gods around them.*)

這是Enns的話：「我們可能對這種描述當時的情況不滿意，因為太過讓步給異教的神話了。」(53頁)

(*We might think that such a scenario is unsatisfying because it gives too much ground to pagan myths [p. 53; my italics].*)

「當上帝選納亞伯拉罕作為一個新民族的祖宗，祂也接受了亞伯拉罕和當時其他人思想上的神話概念。但是上帝不是讓亞伯拉罕仍然留在這神話的世界裡。」

(*. . . God adopted Abraham as the forefather of a new people, and in doing so he also adopted the mythic categories within which Abraham—and everyone else—thought. But God did not simply leave Abraham in his mythic world.*)

「相反的，上帝改造了這些古代神話，以至於以色列的故事集中在它的神身上。」(53-54頁)

(*Rather; [sic] God transformed the ancient myths so that Israel's story would come to focus on its God, the real one [pp. 53-54; my italics].*)

「雖然巴比倫的神話與創世記的創造和洪水很不一樣，但是創世記開始的一二三章，早期的以色列都參與了他們美索不達米亞鄰國的世界觀的。這樣來講，並不是向自由派神學或不信者讓步。我們只不過要承認一個簡單的事實，就是創世記的故事是有文化處境的」，就是他們當時聽者、讀者的了解是按照創世記的文化處境。「而當時的文化處境並不是現代的一個科學的處境，乃是一個神話的處境。」

(The differences notwithstanding [between Babylonians myths and the Genesis creation and flood accounts], the opening chapters of Genesis participate in a worldview that the earliest Israelites shared with their Mesopotamian neighbors. To put it this way is not to concede ground to liberalism or unbelief, but to understand the simple fact that *the stories in Genesis had a context within which they were first understood. And that context was not a modern scientific one but an ancient mythic one* [my italics].)

這是另外新的一點。

「聖經的記載和當時的古近東副本一樣，他們都假設他們所報導的是事實。但聖經的作者不是這樣想，『我們都知道這些‘神話’了，但是我們必須等到科學啟蒙了才可以給我們夠好的答案。』」（55頁）

(*The biblical account, along with its ancient Near East counterparts, assumes the factual nature of what it reports. They did not think, “We know this is all ‘myth’ but it will have to do until science is invented to give us better answers”* [p. 55; my italics].)

就是，他們說，「我們知道是神話就算了。」

「不是的。我們要從他們古代的文化處境來了解創世和洪水的故事，這並不是一個新的看法。根據這個論點，我要強調，創世記植根於古代的神話，並不減輕創世記是神所默示的了。」

(To argue . . . that such biblical stories as creation and the flood must be understood first and foremost in the ancient contexts, is nothing new. *The point I would like to emphasize, however, is that such a firm grounding in ancient myth does not make Genesis less inspired* [p. 56; my italics].)

「現在Beale要總結三點」，（從41頁引用到56頁），「很長的一大段：」（It is important to note three things that he has just said in these extended quotations.）

「首先，舊約的作者所記的歷史不是按照現代的歷史和科學的標準，就表示他們所寫下來的歷史並不符合事實，而是符合古近東的神話。Enns要強調的是，這麼的植根於古代的神話並不表示創世記就不是默示的。因為聖經的作者不假思索的、無意識的吸收了神話，並不表示他所寫下來的比其他的聖經書卷有更少的神的默示。」

(First, that ancient OT writers did not record history according to modern historical and scientific standards means that they did not recount historical events that corresponded with actual past reality, but which corresponded to ANE myth; indeed, Enns wants to “emphasize” that “such a firm grounding in ancient myth does not make Genesis less inspired” (p. 56)! Thus, uncritical and unconscious absorption of myth by a biblical author does not make his writing less inspired than other parts of Scripture.)

「第二，因為君王時期以前的階段，就是沒有這些歷史的證據。所以我



們就要面對一個問題：君王時期前面的歷史是歷史嗎？…大概他的意思就是說，你就不要認為這些君王時期之前的記載裡面是含有『本質上的歷史性』，也就是它沒有『歷史的本質』。」

(Second, and in connection with the first point, Enns says that “the evidence *missing* from the previous [pre-monarchic] periods of Israel’s history . . . raises the problem of the essential historicity of that period,” which, in the light of all Enns has said above, most likely means for him that these premonarchic accounts are not to be viewed as containing “essential historicity.”)

「第三，所以以色列的神話和古近東的神話不同於哪裡呢？不同於以色列的神話宣告：以色列的上帝和旁邊的神明是不一樣的。以色列的神話和古近東的神話之不同，不是說古近東的就不合歷史，而聖經是符合歷史；他們的不同，是在於聖經要強調：聖經裡的神是真的，古近東神話的神明是假的。上帝怎樣改造了這些古代的神話呢？不是在展現一個歷史記錄是符合於過去的歷史，（也就是，創世記是真的，其他是假的），乃是要以色列的故事集中在真神那裡，（也就是，創世記的神是真的，其他的是假神）。」

(Third, the main distinction between the ANE myths and Israel’s myths lies *not in the latter recording reliable history* but in the latter proclaiming that Israel’s God “is different from the gods around them.” It appears fairly clear that the distinction between the ANE mythical accounts of creation and the flood and those of the Genesis accounts is not in the former containing non-history and the latter representing reliable historical events, but the difference is to highlight the biblical God as true in contrast to the false ANE gods. This is the primary way, then, that “*God transformed the ancient myths,*” not in presenting a historical account that corresponds to past historical reality, but causing “Israel’s story . . . to focus on its God, the real one” (p. 54).)

Beale又引用Enns的話：「Enns結論他以上的想法，說，『可能我們並不滿意這幅劇本，因為太過讓步給異教的神話了。』」

(Enns concludes his above thoughts by saying, “we might think that such a scenario is unsatisfying because it gives too much ground to pagan myths” (p. 53).)

Beale說：「是的，我想很多很受尊重的舊約新約福音派學者（不光是那些基要主義派的），事實上，我們都會認為Enns太過讓步給『異教的神話』。除了剛剛我所引用的Enns的那麼多言論，後來Enns也繼續的堅持摩西五經是用一般人的觀念來使用『神話』這個字。稍後，當Enns討論古代以色列人的多神論的時候，他也是這樣用神話的（也就是，非歷史的和虛構的故事）。現在Enns又解釋他的意思：」

(Yes, I think that many practicing respected OT and NT evangelical scholars (and not only fundamentalists) will think that he, indeed, has given way too much ground to “pagan myth.” In addition to the quotations from Enns that I have italicized above, that Enns affirms that the Pentateuch positively adopts *mythical* notions in the essentially normal sense of the

word (i.e. non-historical and fictitious narrative) is also apparent later, when he addresses the question of polytheism in ancient Israel. Here, again Enns explains what he means: )

「我們不要用我們現代的敏感意識來影響我們怎麼看古代以色列的信仰。我們不相信那些諸神曾經存在過，但是古代的近東民族相信這些是存在的。而上帝就是在這樣的宗教世界裡面呼召以色列人出來作祂的子民的。當上帝呼召以色列人的時候，祂是帶領他們進到一個完整的認識，認識祂是誰，(祂是神)，但是耶和華是從他們的處境開始帶領他們，然後他們才一步一步的成長的。」

(It is important here that we not allow our own modern sensitivities to influence how we understand Israel's ancient faith. We may not believe that multiple gods ever existed, but *ancient near Eastern people* did. This is the religious world within which God called Israel to be his people. When God called Israel, he *began* leading them into a full knowledge of who he is, but he started where they were.)

「所以我們不需要驚奇聖經裡描述上帝比周圍外邦的神社還大。舉例，詩篇有好幾個地方都是這樣說的(98頁)。」

「Describe God as *greater than* the gods of the surrounding nations. In the Psalms, for example, this is seen in a number of passages [p. 98].)

例如：耶和華是諸神之上的神。(詩篇86:8，「主啊，諸神之中沒有可比祢的；祢的作為也無可比」；82:1，「神站在有權力者的會中，在諸神中行審判」；138:1，「我要一心稱謝你，在諸神面前歌頌你」。)

Enns說：「我猜想這些詩篇的作者可能覺得…他們不應該採用字面的意思來解釋…假如聖經要比較耶和華和諸神，一定得先假設：神是真的，那些假神也是真的，這樣的比較才有說服力。就好像我們告訴孩子不要害怕黑暗，上帝比這些奇奇怪怪的怪物大。當然，我們大人都知道怪物不是真的，但小孩子認為它們是真的。就像我們今天會比較上帝跟許多很真實的東西：我們的問題、我們的挑戰、我們的仇敵…等等。每個比較都是真的(或都是被認為是真實的)。同樣地，這就是詩篇所作的(99頁)。」

(I suppose one could argue that the psalmists . . . didn't really intend to be taken literally . . . For the comparison [between God and other "gods"] to have any real punch, both entities must be *presumed* to be real. For example, we may tell our children something like, "Don't be afraid of the dark. God is greater than the Boogey Man." Of course, adults who say this know that the Boogey Man is not real, but they know that their *children* believe he is real. Even in contemporary Christian expression, we compare God to many things: our problems, our challenges, our enemies, and so on. And each comparison is made between two real (or perceived to be real) entities. This is what these Psalms are doing as well [p. 99].)

後面Beale他會解釋，沒有問題嘛，因為我們相信偶像背後不過是鬼神、邪

靈，或這些是魔鬼的謊言，但不表示這些神祇就是真的神。這是創世記最重要的要點，這是各位要注意的。